

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date below:

#

January 27, 2003

Date

Shelley M. Fussey

**PATENT** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Roy, Lavrovsky, Tyagi, Song, Chatterjee and Chen

Serial No.: 10/009,420

Filed: December 4, 2001

For: Estrogen Receptor Site-Specific Ribozymes

and Uses Thereof for Estrogen Dependent

**Tumors** 

Group Art Unit: Unknown

Examiner: Unknown

Atty. Dkt. No.: 4003.002300

## RENEWED PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.181

Commissioner for Patents

ATTN: BOX PCT

Office of PCT Legal Administration

Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This is a response to the communication entitled "Decision on Petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181", mailed from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (P.T.O.) *sua sponte* on January 15, 2003 ("the Decision"). As suggested in the Decision, this response has been titled a Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181.

Subsequent to filing the present application, a Notification of Missing Requirements was mailed from the P.T.O. on March 08, 2002 ("the Notice"). Applicants submitted a timely and complete response to the Notice on April 30, 2002 ("Applicants' response"), which was received at the P.T.O. on May 06, 2002.

After receiving a Notice of Recordation of Assignment Document for the Assignment submitted at the same time as Applicants' response, and yet not receiving a Filing Receipt, Applicants' representatives voluntarily contacted the P.T.O. at least on about July 22 and July 31, 2002 to check on the status of the present application. Applicants' representatives were advised that matters were in order, but that submitting a copy of the documents mailed with Applicants' response on April 30, 2002 could speed processing of the application.

On August 01, 2002, Applicants' representatives therefore submitted via facsimile an additional copy of the documents mailed with Applicants' original response of April 30, 2002. Applicants' representatives also telephoned the P.T.O. to monitor the present application at least on about August 08, August 12, August 13, September 06 and September 13, 2002.

On September 17, 2002, again at the suggestion of the P.T.O. to speed processing, Applicants' representatives submitted a further additional copy of the documents mailed with the original response of April 30, 2002 and the facsimile of August 01, 2002 (copy enclosed).

Applicants' representatives further telephoned the P.T.O. regarding the status of the present application at least on about October 23, October 25, October 28, October 30 and October 31, 2002.

On November 01, 2002, at the suggestion of the P.T.O. to ease their burden of locating the sequence listing materials, Applicants' representatives submitted another sequence listing diskette, hard copy and sequence listing statements (copies enclosed).

Applicants' representatives further telephoned the P.T.O. regarding the status of the present application at least on about December 06, December 09 and December 10, 2002, and on about January 13, 2003 and January 14, 2003.

At all points from April 30, 2002 to January 14, 2003, the P.T.O. has reported the present application to be pending and there has been no indication of abandonment.

On January 15, 2003, the instant Decision on Petition was mailed from the P.T.O. The Decision suggests, although does not expressly state, that the present application has been held to be abandoned and that the first of Applicants' series of voluntary submissions (the August 01 facsimile) has been treated as a petition. The Decision further indicates that the perceived Petition has been denied, as Applicants have not provided "an additional copy of the computer-readable format" (of the sequence listing) and as the complete copy of the inventors' declaration as executed by the inventors must be furnished to be Office.

A second computer-readable form of the sequence listing was submitted on November 01, 2002 and the complete inventors' declarations as executed by the inventors were submitted on April 30, 2002 (received on May 06, 2002), with excerpts submitted on August 01 and September 17 via facsimile.

Nonetheless, enclosed herewith is a third computer-readable form of the sequence listing, hard copy and sequence statements, and a complete copy of the inventors' declarations as executed by the inventors.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration on the merits of the petition mailed on January 15, 2003. The components that the petition suggests to be required are enclosed.

No fees should be due. However, should any fees be due or any additional petitions be required, this paper should be considered as such a petition and any necessary fees should be deducted from Applicants' representatives' Deposit Account No. 50-0786/4003.002300.

In light of the International Preliminary Examination Report (IPER) prepared by the U.S. P.T.O., the present claims define a unified invention that is in condition for allowance and an early indication to this effect is respectfully requested.

23720
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley P.M. Fussey, Ph.D. Reg. No. 39,458 Agent for Applicant

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C. 10333 Richmond, Suite 1100 Houston, Texas, 77042 (713) 934-4079

Date: <u>January 27, 2003</u>